

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 343

SP 033 939

AUTHOR Thomas, Adele; Rao, Pam
TITLE Developing an Early Childhood Initiative in Post
Baccalaureate Preservice Teacher Education:
Reflections on Collaboration.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Association of Colleges for Teacher
Education (San Antonio, TX, February 25-28, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference
Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *College School Cooperation;
Collegiality; Cooperating Teachers; *Cooperative
Planning; *Educational Change; Foreign Countries;
Higher Education; Journal Writing; *Participative
Decision Making; Preservice Teacher Education;
Primary Education; *Program Development; Public
Schools; Story Telling; Student Teachers; Student
Teacher Supervisors
IDENTIFIERS Brock University (Canada); Niagara South Board of
Education ON

ABSTRACT

Collaboration between university and school board seems essential in matching core objectives of teacher training with the critical skills and knowledge needed by teachers in new environments. Therefore, Brock University (Ontario, Canada) and the Niagara South Board of Education (Ontario, Canada) established a collaborative early primary teacher education initiative within an existing preservice program. They created a shared funding/shared staff arrangement; a key administrator in the early childhood program facilitated the collaboration, and key personnel met frequently before the beginning of the school year. This initiative was built upon a Brock model in which students were organized into counseling groups. One main contribution of collaboration was increased access of university personnel to cooperating teachers and more personal involvement of cooperating teachers in the supervision of student teachers. During the counseling seminars, formal time was given to reflection through shared storytelling. Both storytelling and journal writing offered insights into how collaboration worked between students and colleagues. As program management has become more routine, the focus of collaborative reflection will shift to how well it meets student needs and how it challenges student teachers to reflect critically on the practices and methods they have experienced. Appendices provide an outline of the seminar reflection process, course outline for the early childhood education methods course, and the form used for evaluation of student teacher performance. (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED348343

DEVELOPING AN EARLY CHILDHOOD INITIATIVE IN POST BACCALAUREATE
PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION: REFLECTIONS ON COLLABORATION

by

Adele Thomas

and

Pam Rao

Brock University

and

Niagara South Board of Education

Ontario, Canada

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Thomas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

**Developing an Early Childhood Initiative in Post Baccalaureate
Preservice Teacher Education: Reflections on Collaboration.**

Adele Thomas and Pam Rao

**Brock University and Niagara South Board of Education
Ontario, Canada**

**Symposium Presentation
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
1992 Annual Meeting**

**San Antonio, Texas
February 26, 1992**

Change in practice is a process of learning and resocialization over a period of time, involving people and relationships among people in order to alter practice. (Fullan & Park, 1981)

In 1985 the Ontario Ministry of Education outlined recommendations for the expansion of early primary programs in the Province and identified areas of need for additional preservice and inservice training of teachers. As policy implementation has proceeded toward goals identified in the Report of the Early Primary Education Project (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1985), early primary teachers and school boards in Ontario have increasingly developed unique and varied program alternatives. These programs have attempted to accommodate the needs of particular communities and the many partners involved in the care and education of young children. In this environment of change in implementing early primary education in schools, collaboration has been viewed as a principal strategy to ensure that chief participants will be actively involved throughout the process in developing early primary education.

By 1990, however, no new initiatives had yet been undertaken within faculties of education in Ontario in response to the 1985 Report recommendations, even though concern had continued to be expressed regarding the adequacy of teacher preparation at the early primary level. Collaboration between university and school board seemed to be essential for developing preservice training in early primary education. Since school boards had been actively engaged in the design and implementation of curriculum in early primary education over the last decade, their experience would be critical in articulating key teacher training practices for early primary education. Collaboration was understood as the basis for increasing the likelihood of matching the core objectives of

SL033939

teacher training with the critical knowledge and skills needed by teachers working in new and evolving educational environments at the early primary level. By working in partnership, university teacher educators and practicing early primary educators could combine their experience and problem solving abilities to clarify the specialized knowledge, skills, and leadership qualities necessary to successfully meet the challenges of providing quality early primary education for Ontario's children. Beyond clarification, these partners could also share the task of preparing prospective teachers to acquire those skills and leadership qualities.

This paper presents reflections during 1991 of two such partners who worked to establish of a collaborative early primary teacher education initiative within an existing preservice program. We have viewed collaboration both as a program goal and as a learning objective for our students and ourselves. As educators, both of us have come to value collaborative skills in curriculum planning and teaching. Over years of sharing with colleagues, the process of collaboration also facilitated the development of critical reflection, while deepening our understanding of individual responsibility within educational institutions. We wanted to be guided by collaborative procedures and approaches as much as possible, while identifying collaboration as a professional skill and goal for our students.

Therefore, it was our intent to apply aspects of a reflective practitioner model (Schon, 1987) as the basis of an evaluative scheme for a collaborative early primary preservice program. As Fullen (1982) clarified, the process of initial implementation and continuation of an innovation should include ongoing monitoring to ensure that innovation remains responsive to the needs of stakeholders and effectively addresses those needs. For the early primary initiative, overall program evaluation includes evaluative feedback at the end of the year from: a) students regarding each of three major components of the program, b) cooperating teachers regarding their role and responsibilities as well as their perceptions of the adequacy of liason with teacher education staff, and c) school and university administrators regarding their role in the preservice program and the effectiveness of the collaborative arrangement.

Beyond this, we sought to further inquire about the challenges for professional growth to students and educators through collaboration. Thus, opportunities for personal reflection writing and discussion were introduced in counselling group seminars for instructors as well as students. We hoped to be able to identify and clarify aspects of the collaborative process which are effective in developing professional understanding and skill. The present paper will address some of those reflections of the two program instructors during the first year of the program. Before turning to our summary reflections, it is necessary to briefly

review the background of the early primary program.

Key Collaborative Factors In The Development Of The Early Primary Program

In 1990, at the start of the collaborative process in developing the early primary teacher education program, Brock University and the Niagara South Board of Education had many factors in their favor, if we consider Fullan's and Park's (1981) list of characteristics by which to judge the relevance of an innovation. The need for such a program was voiced in communities which were experiencing a lack of qualified personnel to staff junior kindergarten programs, as well as in Ministry expectations for expanded early primary education as a reflection of societal goals.

The Niagara South Board had previously implemented a clearly defined program which combined instructional goals, staff development activities, and a philosophy of early primary education which complemented the aims of a prospective teacher training program at Brock. In this respect there was very much a meeting of minds and assumptions about the nature of early primary education and goals for teacher education. In addition, the Niagara South Board's early primary education program became a clear focus for those aspects of training which relate instructional methods to a practicum setting. At the system level, for both institutions, administrators encouraged interested individuals to take responsibility for facilitating the development of a collaborative teacher education program by providing opportunities to discuss the directions such a program might take and identifying that resources would be made available for developing such a program.

Nevertheless, for collaboration to truly occur, individuals must be able to share equally in problem solving and decision making as well as in assuming responsibility for outcomes. It is difficult for two institutions which have little real familiarity with the other's organizational network to expect that such collaboration can be maintained over time. Some realignment was necessary to allow individuals who had no organizational obligations to one another to participate as part of a team for extended periods of time. This was accomplished by identifying a shared funding - shared staff arrangement for the two institutions. An early primary teacher, was selected by the Board to work part time on a weekly basis as a co-counsellor in the early primary teacher education program. This release time participation was funded by the Faculty of Education. This strategy laid the foundation for an institutionally based supportive environment that enables educators from both institutions to engage in team planning, teaching, and practice teaching activities that incorporate all of the resources of both organizations.

Early Primary Program Format

The components of the actual early primary preservice training initiative were then built upon a Brock model in which students are organized into counselling groups of about 25 students each. The early primary teacher education initiative differed from other general counselling groups by admitting into its group only students who graduated with Child Studies majors and who are interested in an early primary education option. This group enters preservice teacher training with prior knowledge in child development and related study of the young child and high motivation to teach young children. The early primary program includes three components: 1) a methods course with an early primary focus, 2) counselling seminars which allow students to explore issues in early primary teaching, 3) field experiences in early primary education settings. Thomas (1991) has provided a more detailed description of the program format.

In seminars a structure for periodic reflection has been established through storytelling in small groups (see Appendix 1). Students engage in sharing personal stories related to professional practice throughout the year and write personal reflections following these discussions. Kilbourn (1991) has recommended the story as an alternative for developing skill in reflection on action. As teachers develop routines and schema for dealing with instructional problems, these habitual patterns of viewing experience can be self limiting obstacles to productive reflection aimed at improving practice. Teachers may sidestep these difficulties by engaging in reflection with others. Kilbourn's (1991) observations indicated that teacher reflections become more focused and less stereotyped as they interact with others who offer different perspectives.

Setting the Stage for Collaboration

The reflective process of preparing this paper may represent collaboration as an intentional endeavour guided by an understanding of procedures or planning for effective collaboration in teacher education. In fact, each of us had little appreciation of what a collaborative approach in teacher education would involve for two strangers with different backgrounds, coming from different work places. Nevertheless, the collaborative process had begun well before the two authors met and was very much dependent on individuals from both organizations who came forward to offer help, based on personal commitment to the goals of the teacher education initiative.

Once the joint program had been approved by the University and the funding arrangement was in place, the key administrator of the early childhood program at the time, a vice-principal, took the initiative to facilitate the collaboration. Amidst personnel

changes in the school board, as well as responsibility for most of the schools in the program, this vice-principal found the time on several occasions to meet with the first author in order to learn about the components of the preservice program and to suggest ways that the school board might be involved. She was instrumental not only in recommending a school which would be a good site for our microteaching centre, she arranged and attended the introductory meeting with that school's staff and the university representative. This administrator was more than helpful in sharing early childhood curriculum documents recently developed by the school board, which were later incorporated into resource materials for the Methods component of the preservice program. Her consistent interest in the joint venture led to open discussions of how to further promote collaboration in the delivery of the Methods course. In addition to identifying individual teachers throughout the Board's early childhood program, who had been involved in professional development workshops for staff and who might be able to offer sessions on aspects of early childhood methods, she facilitated contact with these individuals.

Prior to the initial operation of the new program, probably the most valuable assistance from this key school board administrator was advice on candidates for the position of faculty advisor. Both the vice-principal and the first author saw the qualifications for this position in terms of a teacher who demonstrated highly effective skills in the classroom, had enthusiasm for teaching young children, and could communicate these aspects to student teachers, while sharing a commitment to professional growth in a collaborative context. The second author came highly recommended on all of these dimensions.

In recalling the authors' first meeting, the outstanding aspect was the enthusiasm we both shared for the venture and the quite unabashed fun we both anticipated. Both looked forward to the opportunity to becoming part of problem solving process with student teachers, many of whom would be experiencing classroom life and interaction with young children for the first time. For the second author there would be obstacles to overcome in order to participate in the collaboration. The collaboration with a full time, practicing teacher was critical for providing student teachers access to reality testing grounded in practice as well as a desirable role model. In order to accomplish this, time from Rao's classroom would be required to participate in seminars, practice teaching, and the Methods course. This would have to be accomplished without sacrificing her classroom teaching and the needs of her junior kindergarten students. It was decided that we would not specify the exact amount of time that would be required weekly, while the Board would attempt to find a substitute teacher who would be available on a regular basis, so that Pam's weekly departures would become accepted by her jk students as part of routine. Both of us agreed to be flexible in terms of requiring both to attend every class session. Since the preservice program

required a full week of orientation on the same week that junior kindergarten opened in September, accommodation would have to be made immediately in order to ensure that both obligations would be met.

We met almost weekly after school, between March and June, prior to September's initial meeting with preservice students. Without explicitly identifying roles or tasks, our interactions were often guided by the real demands of Rao's daily teaching obligations. While Thomas might plan a tentative agenda for a meeting so not to waste time, just as often ad hoc phone calls over a lunch hour would resolve a decision on some task needed. Thomas took on administrative tasks which could be more easily accomplished outside the meetings, such as completing a course outline or preparing materials for a meeting with cooperating practicum teachers. Rao took responsibility for initiating informal discussions with teachers about becoming a cooperating teacher, arranging formal planning meetings with cooperating teachers, and engaging in informal discussions with teachers who might teach individual sessions of seminars or the Methods course. Both managed meetings with Board teachers to explain the preservice program, and engaged in further discussions with the vice principal to identify components of a methods course that would reflect key components of practice that student teachers would experience in their teaching practica (see Appendix 2).

In looking back at those early planning months, as a university-based teacher educator, Thomas found that the receptiveness of teachers to participation, the access to a pool of teaching expertise for workshops, and the openness of school discussions about curriculum and teaching contrasted with her earlier experiences in preservice programming. It seemed that in approaching a school, instead of having to guess at who might be able and available to participate, instead of having to explain the value of preservice teacher education participation to too-busy administrators and teachers, individuals had taken ownership of the process and were just as committed to seeing it work effectively.

Aspects of Collaboration and Its Challenges in Program Development

One of the major contributions of our collaboration has been increased access to and personal involvement of cooperating teachers in supervising student teachers. In the spring prior to preservice student entrance, a meeting was held with all early childhood teachers, with half day release time being arranged by the Board. This latter Board gesture underscored that the teacher education initiative was viewed as worthwhile for all teachers. This was reinforced when all of the new program administrators opened our first meeting with a welcome. The meeting was identified as a working session for prospective cooperating teachers to review the practicum evaluation reporting process so

that it would reflect supervision criteria that matched their conception of teaching. Work groups were formed to make recommendations for revisions of the summary student teacher evaluation report to reflect specific teaching skills at the early primary level. The original report form addressed general skills to be used by primary, junior, and intermediate level cooperating teachers. Most early primary teachers found the descriptions of teaching interaction based on formal, teacher-directed lessons inappropriate for their child-centred, play oriented classroom environments. Appendix 3 is a reduced version of the revised student teacher evaluation form which resulted from teacher recommendations. Many of the items themselves were reworked and submitted as early primary alternatives by teachers.

From Thomas' perspective, teacher interest in supervising preservice students was heartening. Having been used to "beating the bushes" to attract teachers who always seemed too busy to take on student teacher supervision, this enthusiasm of junior kindergarten teachers was somewhat surprising. At the end of the first spring meeting, virtually every junior kindergarten teacher signed up to take a student teacher the following year. Rao saw it from a different light. She noted that the junior kindergarten teachers had been somewhat segregated from the rest of the primary division. They had gotten to know each other very well over the last several years, since they often had their own professional development sessions and program planning was often conducted with the entire group. Consequently, the group had a high degree of camaraderie and the identification that the early childhood program was special within the Board. They viewed participation in the preservice program as further evidence that the program was special. In addition, Rao indicated that the request for junior kindergarten teachers to participate in preservice teacher education would be a demonstration that they were fully participating professionals, rather than "second class" teachers involved in "babysitting" programs undistinguished from day care.

Student teacher field experiences proved to be a further step in developing collaborations with practicing teachers. All of the cooperating teachers had prior supervisory relationships with community college students preparing to be day care professionals. Nevertheless, few of the teachers had prior experience supervising preservice student teachers. At a cooperating teacher meeting held during the first student practicum, some teachers indicated difficulty in accommodating student teacher needs for personal feedback sessions in the beginning of the block. Part of the difficulty seemed to be based on the timing of the first practice teaching block which occurred during home visitations. For junior kindergarten teachers, scheduling more than 40 home visits during this period allowed no time for personal attention to student teachers during their first week of practice teaching. On the other hand, teachers were uniformly surprised at the high level of student teacher curriculum planning, and interactional teaching

skills. In discussions with cooperating teachers at this meeting, one had the sense that cooperating teachers were beginning to adjust their expectations of student teacher responsibilities. Some anticipated the next practicum and spoke about giving up more direct control of the management of their classrooms so that student teachers could become more independently involved in planning for student learning and conducting the day-to-day program. This latter development was possible only after cooperating teachers had had personal experience with competent student teachers and were reassured that student learning had been positively affected.

It was Thomas' impression that the discussions which occurred at the meeting held during the first student teaching practicum were open and frank, not only because teachers were well known to each other, but also because they had accepted a partnership in which they were responsible for preservice teacher training. For example, teacher notes accompanied returning student evaluation reports, indicating that teachers were expecting to have a voice in further revising the reporting process. At the present time these modifications await further review with cooperating teachers. Rao felt that the discussions held at this meeting were enhanced by the nature of the partnership between herself and Thomas. As a working staff member of this team of associate teachers Rao was able to reinterpret Thomas's requests for supervision into workable terms for the teachers. Being actively involved in the classroom as well as the Faculty of Education gave Rao the capability to view things from both sides and interpret university expectations in terms that teachers could accommodate.

In turning our attention to collaboration with our students, a significant addition in conducting counselling seminars with the early primary group has been the inclusion of formal opportunities for reflection through shared storytelling (Appendix 1). Student teachers seem to have responded positively to the task and since these activities are currently on-going, trends in the professional growth of our student teachers through student stories will be analyzed at a later time. Nevertheless, for the two authors, attempts at collaborative narrative inquiry have not been easy to maintain during the first six months of the program. Although neither of the authors had prior experience with narrative inquiry, Thomas initiated the focus partly because the approach seemed to offer the possibility of capturing some of the dynamic interaction and change accompanying the program's development. However, it has often occurred that under the inexorable press of limited time to meet and to get things done, one of the first things to be eliminated has been our attempts at collaborative narrative inquiry. Nevertheless, the times we have managed to engage in story telling together and in journal writing, have rewarded each of us with insights into how our collaboration plays itself out with our students and colleagues.

Thomas' early reflections seem to have centred on program management and have been characterized by pleasant surprise and relief. Initial journal entries noted pleasure in coordinating seminars and microteaching with Rao whose current teaching experience provided specific examples from her daily happenings for student questions about classroom management. Rao had an intuitive sense of sharing so that many initial details of arranging placements or guest speakers seemed to fall into place. Thus for Thomas there were lots of little surprises such as having several offers to contribute to the Methods course from excellent teachers and having the Board early childhood administrators volunteer to participate in seminars. In actuality these events occurred because Rao had also had contact with many of these people or might simply suggest, "Would you like me to speak to so and so?"

Rao's initial reflections seem to have focused on her anxiety over becoming an equal working partner or co counsellor with Thomas. Although she was confident in her abilities to share her experience with pre-service students and her resources with Thomas, Rao was apprehensive about her lack of familiarity with the University's policies and programs. As Thomas gradually introduced Rao to the workings of the Faculty, Rao's journal entries reflect that this initial anxiety lessened as she has become more comfortable with her new role as counsellor. Rao's journal entries reflect positively upon the collaboration between both advisors. Thomas' expertise and familiarity with the pre service program helped to give Rao the confidence to begin to assert herself in her role of counsellor.

Later reflections by Rao focused on her ability to continue to effectively pursue the role of counsellor while maintaining high expectations for her own junior kindergarten classes. Rao's journal entries also referred to an interesting position in which she frequently found herself. As a teacher acquainted with most of the cooperating teachers, she was faced with a sense of professional obligation to her colleagues in discussions with students who would sometimes share negative impressions from individual placements. Both Thomas and Rao tried to clarify for students how discussions on teaching may be conducted in a problem solving, constructive, and professional manner. It was understood that teacher dialogue has its beginning in the pre service experience and that the pragmatics of professional dialogue are learned at this time. Nevertheless, there was a conflict for Rao, in that she also wanted to encourage students to freely voice critical observations and concerns. Rao felt it necessary to occasionally express to students her hope that they would not perceive that they had to inhibit their opinions for fear of offending Rao because of her role as a school board employee or member of a teaching fraternity.

For Thomas and Rao the collaboration has had a strong foundation from which to grow. But as program management has

become more routine the focus of collaborative reflection will shift to questions of how well the program is addressing the needs of students, and the extent to which the program is challenging student teachers to critically reflect on the practices and methods they have experienced in the early primary program. As both authors renew a commitment to continue collaborative narrative inquiry it is hoped that their reflections will act as a regulatory mechanism for maintaining on-going professional growth

REFERENCES

Boak, T. & Ellis, M. (1991). Student perceptions of quality of life in the Faculty of Education: Results of a survey. Brock Education, 1(12), 1-7.

Bredekamp, S. (Ed.) (1987). Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth to Age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Federation of Women Teachers' Association of Ontario (1986). Active Learning in the Early School Years. Toronto: FWTAO.

Fullan, M. (1982) The Meaning of Educational Change. Toronto, ONT: OISE Press.

Fullan, M. & Park, P. (1981). Curriculum Implementation. Toronto, ONT: OISE Press.

High Scope Educational Research Foundation. (1973). The High Scope Early Elementary Program. Ypsilanti, MI: High Scope Educational Research Foundation.

Kilbourn, B. (1991). Self monitoring in teaching. American Educational Research Journal, 28(4), 721-736.

Kilgore, K., Ross, D., & Zbikowski, J. (1990). Understanding the teaching perspectives of first year teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 41(1), 28 - 38.

Mitchell, A. Seligson, M., & Marx, F. (1989). Early Childhood Programs and the Public Schools: Between Promise and Practice. Dover, MA: Auburn House.

Niagara South Board of Education. (1990). Growing Through Play. Welland, ONT: Niagara South Board of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1991). The Early Years Consultation Paper. Toronto, ONT, Canada.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1985). Report of the Early Primary Education Project. Toronto, ONT: Ministry of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1975). The Formative Years. Toronto, ONT: Ministry of Education.

Schon, D. A. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Thomas, A. (1991). Preservice Early Primary Education: A Collaborative School Board and University Program. Report to the Faculty of Education, Brock University, St. Catharines, ONT.

Warner, C. (1988). A Resource Guide to Public School Early Childhood Programs. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Zeicher, K. & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Education Review, 57(1), 23-48.

APPENDIX I

12

SEMINAR REFLECTION PROCESS

This process is designed to enhance reflection as a part of personal knowledge and growth in teaching.

Number in group = 3.

Steps to the Process

- 1a) Tell the other two people in your group 3 different teaching "stories" that you believe have had an impact on your thinking. These stories may simply be events that you particularly remember from your past experience.
- 1b) The other two people listen and make notes of their reactions. These reactions can be overall impressions, a similar experience, a question, the identification of a dominant image or metaphor of teaching, etc.
2. Listen to the response from one colleague at a time.
3. Respond to each colleague immediately after listening. This response can take the form of a clarification, another story, a question, disagreement, etc. (Then repeat 2. and 3. for your other colleague.)
4. Written Response

Other the next few days, reflect upon the process and give some thought to your personal growth in teaching. Then write a reaction (about 2 pages) to give to your counsellors.

These questions may help guide your thinking:

- a) What you do know about your teaching self?
- b) What self images come to mind?
- c) What do you hope)
 wish)
 imagine)
 you will be like as a teacher?

DUE: Two weeks after the reflection session.

Nov. 26	Activity Time - Creativity/ Painting	Shirley Ann Teal Barbara Romanowich
Dec. 3	Literature Based Themes - Holistic Learning	Margaret Denison
Dec. 10	Gross Motor/Movement	Margaret Denison
Dec. 17	Writing - Emergent Literacy	Patty Moore Lincoln County Bd.
Jan. 7	Unit Planning and Teaching	General Methods - Bill MacDonald
Jan. 14	Unit Planning and Teaching	Bill MacDonald
Jan. 21	Pupil Evaluation in the Classroom	Bill MacDonald
Jan. 28	Pupil Evaluation in the Classroom	Bill MacDonald
Feb. 4	Special Needs Children	Noreen Barkley

----- (Teaching Block 2 - Feb. 10 to Feb. 28) -----

March 3	Special Needs Children - Speech and Language	Lynette Runfolo
March 10	Working with Parents/ Volunteers in the Classroom	Liza Klepses Klepses
March 24	Getting Ready for September - Staggered Entry	Pam Rao

ASSIGNMENTS

In keeping with the overall 8F08 student assignment requirements, one major assignment will be the completion of a teaching unit of two to three weeks' length implemented either in Teaching Block 2 or 3. The format will be similar to that required for all 8F08 Methods students. (See unit assignment summary enclosed.)

APPENDIX II

Course Outline

Early Childhood Education Methods (Ed 8F08)

Instructors: Dr. Adele Thomas, Rm. 8b, 688-5550 Ext.3341
Pam Rao, Niagara South Board of Education, 734-3748

Texts:

Creating the Child Centred Classroom, S. Schwartz and M. Polishuke.
Irwin, 1990.

Holistic Learning, J. Miller, B. Cassie, S. Drake. OISE Press,
1990.

****PLEASE NOTE**** Students are not required to also purchase the 8F08
Module Package. The texts for this ECE Methods section will replace
the 8F08 Module text.

Class times: Tuesdays, 3:30-5:00 p.m. Room: 204

TOPIC SCHEDULE

Sept. 10	Overview of the NSBE ECE Program. ("Growing Through Play")	Shirley Ann Teal Pam Rao Adele Thomas
Sept. 17	Curriculum Models for ECE (High Scope, Montessori)	Arlene Grierson
Sept. 24	Routines, Room Arrangement and Classroom Management	Wendy O'Brien
Oct. 1	Observation and Journal Writing	Pam Rao
Oct. 8	Circle Time - Listening, Questioning	Pam Rao Adele Thomas
Oct. 15	Circle Time - Story Telling	Mary Lynn Goodwill Joanne Morris
Oct. 22	Activity Time - Science "Kindermucking"	John Henry Hamilton Board 527-5092, ext. 373 Fax: 416-521-2536
Oct. 29	Activity Time - Blocks	Sandy Stevenson

Valerie Dunne

----- Teaching Block 1 - Nov. 4 to Nov. 22) -----

Faculty of Education, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario L2S 3A1
 (416)688-5550 Ext 3341 Fax (416) 685-4131
 ECE ASSOCIATE REPORT ON STUDENT TEACHING

Student Teacher: _____ Date: _____
 Faculty Associate: _____ Division/Grade: _____
 School: _____ Principal: _____ Board: _____
 Dates Absent: _____ Setting/Subject Area: _____

Please complete the following by checking the letter which most adequately reflects the frequency of each behaviour. Indicate whether this represents a view of the student after observing his/her work over the entire block or one specific period of time. Refer to the Associate Handbook for guidance.)

Key: C=Consistently S=Sometimes R=Rarely NA=Not Applicable

This report is based on observation during the:

☐ Whole Block

☐ Partial Block

Indicate Time Period (e.g. one week)

☐ Other

Indicate Time Period (e.g. one lesson)

Professionalism: The student teacher:

1. showed initiative (volunteered ideas; shared materials; took on additional teaching tasks.) C S R NA
2. adjusted appropriately to the school culture. C S R NA
3. performed other required duties (yard, bus, washroom, etc.). C S R NA
4. arrived at the centre in time to ready the classroom for daily activities. C S R NA
5. displayed professional deportment (dress, grooming, manner, speech). C S R NA
6. responded positively to counselling. C S R NA

Pre-active skills: The student teacher:

1. maintained an organized complete plan book. C S R NA
2. planned appropriate literature based themes containing appropriate activities to meet objectives. C S R NA
3. was prepared to facilitate learning (materials, equipment activities, snack, etc. ready when the day begins). C S R NA
4. displayed appropriate understanding of child development. C S R NA
5. displayed understanding of the role of an early childhood facilitator:
promoted independent learning C S R NA
encouraged children to become independent problem solvers through play. C S R NA

Post-active skills: The student teacher:

1. achieved objectives for activity or literature based themes. C S R NA
2. evaluated learner growth and development:
used a variety of observation techniques effectively. C S R NA
used observations to make appropriate interpretations regarding program objectives and individual student growth. C S R NA
3. was a reflective practitioner:
was proactive rather than reactive. C S R NA
incorporated suggestions into future planning. C S R NA

Inter-active skills: The student teacher:

1. followed established class routines. C S R NA
adjusted routines when needed. C S R NA
2. maintained class control. C S R NA
use positive reinforcement. C S R NA
displayed awareness of possible disruptions. C S R NA
displayed ability to effectively redirect children to more suitable activities. C S R NA
3. provided motivation for learning through play. C S R NA
4. fostered active learning. C S R NA
5. obtained full pupil involvement through play in a variety of activities and centres. C S R NA
6. used his/her voice effectively. C S R NA
7. used language appropriately. C S R NA
Weaknesses were evident in:
Grammar ___ Spelling ___ Use of Slang ___
Handwriting ___ Level of language ___ C S R NA
8. posed appropriate questions to stimulate the child's discoveries at:
learning centres. C S R NA
small group activities. C S R NA
large group discussions. C S R NA
9. received answers appropriately. C S R NA
10. managed groups effectively. C S R NA
11. ensured smooth transitions between activities. C S R NA
12. enthusiasm for teaching. C S R NA
13. used a variety of related teaching materials across learning centres. C S R NA
14. planned integrated activities allowing for individual differences. C S R NA
15. effectively guided children's explorations. C S R NA
16. had good rapport with students. C S R NA

Summary Comments: ☐ outstanding ☐ highly successful ☐ successful ☐ marginal ☐ failure

Principal/Department Head

Faculty Associate

Student Teacher (Group #)

White-Student Teacher's Copy Canary-Faculty Office Copy Pink-Faculty Member's Copy Gold-Associate Teacher's Copy